



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,837	03/26/2001	G. Eric Engstrom	112076-138339	9404
25943 7590 10/16/2009 Schwabe Williamson & Wyatt PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900 1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE PORTLAND, OR 97204				
EXAMINER THOMPSON, MICHAEL M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/16/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/817,837

**Applicant(s)**

ENGSTROM, G. ERIC

**Examiner**

Michael M. Thompson

**Art Unit**

3629

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 45-64 and 66-74 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 45-64 and 66-74 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C2)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 45-64 and 66-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. In particular, it is unclear how Applicant's invention implements the nexus between determining a categorization of a web site and then provides a desired persona based on categorization of the web site. Applicant's arguments and specification state that the invention creates specific persona profiles to register with a given web site based on the web site content. It is unclear to the Examiner how the invention is enabled to allow for the profile to be developed with any information in addition to profile information commonly requested. As in Applicant's specification, the golf example is provided to illustrate how a profile may be generated. It is unclear how this information is generated for a golf site or any other site accessed in real time for any information specific to the web site without some initial input from the user. For example if the user switches from the golf web site to a sports web site, how does Applicant's invention provide a specific persona to the sports web site registration, where the specific persona is in response to the new site and is beyond the "typical"

information expected for registration. It is unclear how the system can anticipate or even generate information that may be specific to the categorization of the web site. For these reasons, the invention does not appear to be enabled and would require undue experimentation in order to determine these functions.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 73 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claim elements "means for receiving/causing/transmitting" are means (or step) plus function limitation that invokes 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. However, the written description fails to clearly link or associate the disclosed structure, material, or acts to the claimed function such that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize what structure, material, or acts perform the claimed function. It is unclear as to what structure Applicant intends the means language to comprise.

Applicant is required to:

(a) Amend the claim so that the claim limitation will no longer be a means (or step) plus function limitation under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph; or

(b) Amend the written description of the specification such that it clearly links or associates the corresponding structure, material, or acts to the claimed function without introducing any new matter (35 U.S.C. 132(a)); or

(c) State on the record where the corresponding structure, material, or acts are set forth in the written description of the specification that perform the claimed function. For more information, see 37 CFR 1.75(d) and MPEP §§ 608.01(o) and 2181.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 45-64 and 66-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiloh (US 2001/0037316) or Shiloh (US 7412422) in view of Hegli et al. (US 6,606,659).**

7. **With respect to claim 45**, both Shiloh references teach a method of operation, performed by a device, comprising: receiving by the device (i.e. either the user computer itself or the RU/VU database computer/server for example, col. 4 and 16 or the Figures), from a first server of a first service provider, a request for registration information for a user of the device to register with a web site (i.e. the idea of Shiloh being used for registration purposes and transacting in col. 4, lines 30-41, and as defined under “real entity”, “real personality” or “real user”), the registration information requested including one or more personality characteristics (i.e. Inherent in registration process due to the broadest reasonable interpretation of personality characteristics such as but not limited to Shiloh's depiction of “real personality” and his teaching of the

virtual personality co. 4, lines 30-41 and col. 4, line 65 thru col. 5, lines 1-7, *passim*); the device causing a second server of a second service provider to dynamically generate and provide a personality profile having one or more personality characteristics to portray a desired persona, the second service provider providing a personality service; (i.e. the Virtual Personality Database and/or AVPP, and figures showing the different servers such as Figure 2) and transmitting by the device, or the device causing the second server to transmit, the personality profile to the first server to respond to the request. (i.e. this occurs for example in Figure 2 where the AVPP system or the equivalent virtual embodiment is utilized by a user to interact over the internet with registration systems mentioned above.) Both Shiloh references further teach that the one or more personality characteristics are based at least in part on content of a service provided by the first service provider. In particular, column 4, lines 30-42 describe the use of the AVPP system to satisfy registration to sites over the internet. Various sites over the internet are interacted with by the AVPP system, which may be construed as the second service provider, providing the anonymous profile as described by reference numeral 10 of Figure 1.

However, it appears that the Shiloh references fail to explicitly recite the generation of personality characteristics for a desired persona, based at least in part on a determined categorization of the web site. Hegli et al. teaches determining the categorization of a web site by random access of an address from a categorized web database in a process that eventually determines whether the site is accepted or rejected/postponed based on the information derived about the site and its

categorization. Hegli et al. teaches an additional step wherein if a determination is made that the user's computer does not have a stored cookie from the website, the process will move to request registration information from the user (i.e. at least show at col. 16 and 17 as described at least through Figures 8 and 9 and the descriptions thereof). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention to have modified the Shiloh references to include a system to determines the categorization of a web site as taught by Hegli et al. for the well know purpose of providing controlled access to web sites when providing registration information for security purposes. Given the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims, the combination of Shiloh and Hegli et al. both teach the generation of a specific persona based on determining the categorization of a web site. In short, the site is determined first, ultimately determining when and if the user might register. Please also note Col. 16 of the Shiloh references further recognizing the adaptation of profile information. Applicant(s) are reminded that optional or conditional elements do not narrow the claims because they can always be omitted. See e.g. MPEP §2106 II C: "Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. [Emphasis in original.]; and In re Johnston, 435 F.3d 1381, 77 USPQ2d 1788, 1790 (Fed. Cir. 2006) ("As a matter of linguistic precision, optional elements do not narrow the claim because they can always be omitted." (where the Federal Circuit affirmed the Board's claim construction of "further including that said wall may be smooth, corrugated, or profiled with increased dimensional proportions as pipe size is increased"

since "this additional content did not narrow the scope of the claim because these limitations are stated in the permissive form 'may.'")

8. **With respect to claim 46**, both Shiloh references teach the method of claim 45, wherein the method further comprises the device requesting the first service provider for information. (i.e. this is inherent Shiloh when the user computer accesses the service provider website and inherently exchanges information upon execution of the website address.)

9. **With respect to claim 47**, both Shiloh references teach the method of claim 45, wherein the personality profile is provided by the second server of the personality service provider, and transmitted to the first server of the first service provider by the device, and the method further comprises receiving by the device, the personality profile from the second server of the personality service provider. (i.e. the thrust of the Shiloh patent is a virtual profile that is capable of providing information to the user for use in accessing websites as shown at least in the Figures.)

10. **With respect to claim 48**, both Shiloh references teach the method of claim 45, wherein the personality profile is provided by the second server of the personality service provider, and the method further comprises receiving by the device, a list of personality profiles from the second server of the personality service provider, the list having been put together by the second server of the personality service provider, and selecting by the device, a personality profile from the list of personality profiles. (i.e. as recited in col.8, the personality service provider and AVPP can create it's own line of virtual products to be offered to the user.)



11. **With respect to claim 49**, both Shiloh references teach the method of claim 45, wherein the personality profile is generated by the device, and transmitted to the first server of the first service provider by the device. (i.e. as in the case when the user chooses it's own custom profile, the user device (potentially designated as either the user input and user's computer or RU/VU database computer. In short, the profile can be generated by the users computer through user input when registering with service providers.)

12. **With respect to claim 50**, both Shiloh references teach the method of claim 45, wherein the method further comprises requesting by the device, to initiate an e-commerce transaction with the first service provider, or to participate in a chat session hosted by the first service provider. (i.e. Col. 4 and 5)

13. **With respect to claim 51**, both Shiloh references teach the method of claim 45, wherein said one or more personality characteristics comprise at least one selected from a group consisting of a description of hobbies, a description of interests, and a biographical description. (i.e. col. 4 and 5 describe at least biographical information such as imaginary name, imaginary address in response to e-commerce or registration sites accessed by the real personality/user.)

14. **With respect to claim 52**, both Shiloh references teach a method of operation, performed by a first server of a first service provider providing a personality service, comprising: receiving by the first server, from a client device, a request to dynamically generate and provide a personality profile having one or more personality characteristics for a user of the client device (i.e. as described in claim 45, this process

is inherent in any computer to computer interaction where there is a request for information and is taught in Shiloh. This is taught when the user computer accesses the AVPP databases to request a virtual identity), for responding to a request of a second server of a second service provider, requesting for registration information for the user, the registration information requested including the one or more personality characteristics (i.e. this is a request as described in col. 4 wherein the real personality is prompted to register and the AVPP system provides virtual identities); providing by the first server, a personality profile having the one or more personality characteristics for response, the one or more personality characteristics being based at least in part on content of a service provided by the second service provider; and transmitting by the first server to the client device or the second server the generated personality profile. (i.e. Shiloh teaches the virtual identity for use in providing information to the first server based on characteristics as described in the rejection of claims 45-51 above.)

However, Shiloh fails to explicitly recite a request to determine content of a web site provided by a second service provider, to categorize the web site based on the content and provide by the first server, a personality profile based at least in part on the categorization of the web site. Hegli et al. teaches determining the categorization of a web site by random access of an address from a categorized web database in a process that eventually determines whether the site is accepted or rejected/postponed based on the information derived about the site and its categorization. Hegli et al. teaches an additional step wherein if a determination is made that the user's computer does not have a stored cookie from the website, the process will move to request

registration information from the user (i.e. at least show at col. 16 and 17 as described at least through Figures 8 and 9 and the descriptions thereof). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention to have modified the Shiloh references to include a system to determines the categorization of a web site as taught b y Hegli et al. for the well know purpose of providing controlled access to web sites when providing registration information for security purposes. Given the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims, the combination of Shiloh and Hegli et al. both teach the generation of a specific persona based on determining the categorization of a web site. In short, the site is determined first, ultimately determining when and if the user might register. Applicant(s) are reminded that optional or conditional elements do not narrow the claims because they can always be omitted. See e.g. MPEP §2106 II C: "Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. [Emphasis in original.];" and In re Johnston, 435 F.3d 1381, 77 USPQ2d 1788, 1790 (Fed. Cir. 2006) ("As a matter of linguistic precision, optional elements do not narrow the claim because they can always be omitted." (where the Federal Circuit affirmed the Board's claim construction of "further including that said wall may be smooth, corrugated, or profiled with increased dimensional proportions as pipe size is increased" since "this additional content did not narrow the scope of the claim because these limitations are stated in the permissive form 'may.'"))

15. **With respect to claim 53**, both Shiloh references teach the method of claim 52, wherein said receiving comprises receiving by the first server, the one or more

requested personality characteristics from the client device. (i.e. inherent when the client device such as the user computer or the RU/VU database computer provides information. The user could fill out the requested information or the information provided by the AVPP server can be used. Please note rejections above.)

16. **With respect to claim 54**, both Shiloh references teach the method of claim 52, wherein the method further comprises the first server ascertaining the service offered by the second service provider, based at least in part on a communication between a server of the second service provider and the first server. (i.e. this could be any means by which the first service provider receives the second service providers virtual identity/information. Shiloh teaches the use of the virtual identity where the second server generates an identity that is communicated to the first server. Please note rejections above.)

17. **With respect to claim 55**, both Shiloh references teach the method of claim 52, wherein said providing comprises identifying by the first server, for the client device, a plurality of personality profiles; and receiving by the first server, from the client device, a selection of one of the identified personality profiles. (i.e. as recited in col.8, the personality service provider and AVPP can create it's own line of virtual products to be offered to the user. These identities would be offered and accepted by the user/ user's computer.)

18. **With respect to claim 56**, both Shiloh references teach the method of claim 52, wherein said providing comprises generating by the first server one or more personality profiles having the one or more personality characteristics. (As described above, the

Shiloh virtual identities and personal characteristics are created in response to the information requested by the servers.)

19. **With respect to claim 57**, both Shiloh references teach the method of claim 52, wherein said one or more personality characteristics comprise at least one of a description of hobbies, a description of interests, and a biographical description. (i.e. This claim is similarly rejected as to that of claim 51.)

20. **With respect to claim 58**, both Shiloh references in combination with Hegli et al. teach an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions that, if executed by the computing device, cause the computing device, to receive from a first server of a first service provider, a request for registration information for a user of the apparatus to register with a web site, the registration information requested including one or more personality characteristics, cause a second server of a second service provider to dynamically generate and provide a personality profile having one or more personality characteristics, the one or more personality characteristics based at least in part on a determined categorization of the web site, the second service provider providing a personality service, and transmit, or cause the second server of the personality service provider to transmit, the personality profile to the first server of the first service provider to respond to the request; and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the plurality of programming instructions. (i.e. With respect to claim 58, in the least this medium readable claim is rejected under a similar rationale as that of the rejection of claims 45 and 52.)

21. **With respect to claim 59**, both Shiloh references teach the apparatus of claim 58, wherein said plurality of instructions stored on the storage medium are further designed to enable the computing device to perform at least a selected one from the group consisting of requesting information from the first service provider, initiating an e-commerce transaction with the first service provider, and participating in a chat session hosted by the first service provider (i.e. This claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 58).

22. **With respect to claim 60**, both Shiloh references teach the apparatus of claim 58, wherein said plurality of instructions stored on the storage medium are designed to enable the computing device to request the personality service provider for the personality profile (i.e. This claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 58).

23. **With respect to claim 61**, both Shiloh references teach the apparatus of claim 60, wherein said plurality of instructions stored on the storage medium are further designed to enable the computing device to receive a list of personality profiles from the personality service provider, and identify for the personality service provider a selected one of the list of personality profiles (i.e. This claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 58).

24. **With respect to claim 62**, both Shiloh references teach the apparatus of claim 58, wherein said plurality of instructions stored on the storage medium are designed to enable the computing device to generate the personality profile. (i.e. This claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 58. On further note, this claim is construed to be the computer system enabling the user to create the profile when accessing the

website that is requesting the information. The operating system allows a user to enter information which allows the apparatus to generate the personality profile.)

25. **With respect to claim 63**, both Shiloh references teach the apparatus of claim 58, wherein said one or more personality characteristics comprise at least one of a description of hobbies, a description of interests, and a biographical description. (i.e. This claim is similarly rejected to that of claim 51 and 57.)

26. **With respect to claim 64**, the combination of both Shiloh references and Hegli et al. teach a computer readable medium having instructions stored thereon that , if executed cause the computing device to perform a method comprising dynamically generating and providing a personality profile having one or more personality characteristics for a user of a client device for use to register the user with a web site of a service provider, the one or more personality characteristics based at least in part on a determined categorization of the web site. (i.e. With respect to claim 64, these medium readable claims is rejected under a similar rationale as that of the rejection of claims 45, 52 and 58.) **It should be noted that Applicant's claim amendments filed 8-18-2009 are not properly marked for changes with respect to claim 64.** In order to advance prosecution, Examiner has provided a rejection. Appropriate correction is required.

27. **With respect to claim 66**, both Shiloh references teach the computer readable medium of claim 64, wherein the programming instructions are designed to enable the apparatus to provide a list of personality profiles to the client device, and receive a

selection from the provided list from the client device. (i.e. This claim is similarly rejected to that of claim 64.)

28. **With respect to claim 67**, both Shiloh references teach the computer readable medium of claim 64, wherein said one or more personality characteristics comprise at least one of a description of hobbies, a description of interests, and a biographical description. (i.e. This claim is similarly rejected to that of claims 51, 57 and 64.)

29. **With respect to claim 68**, both Shiloh references teach the computer readable medium of claim 64, wherein said plurality of instructions are further designed to either enable the apparatus to transmit the personality profile to the client device, or transmit the personality profile to a server of the service provider. (i.e. This claim is similarly rejected to that of claim 64.)

30. **With respect to claim 69**, the combination of both Shiloh references and Hegli et al. teach a system comprising: a networking interface; a storage medium coupled to the networking interface, and having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to enable the system to, receive from a first server of a first service provider, a request for registration information for a user of the system to register with a web site, the registration information requested including one or more personality characteristics, cause a second server of a second service provider to dynamically generate and provide a personality profile having one or more personality characteristics, the one or more personality characteristics based at least in part on a determined categorization of the web site, the second service provider providing a personality service, and transmit, or cause the second server of the personality service



provider to transmit, the personality profile to the first server of the first service provider to respond to the request; and a processor coupled to the storage medium and the networking interface to execute the programming instructions. (i.e. This claim is similarly rejected to that of claims 45, 52, 58 and 64.)

31. **With respect to claim 70**, both Shiloh references teach the system of claim 69, wherein the programming instructions are further designed to enable the system to perform at least a selected one from the group consisting of requesting information from the first service provider, initiating an e-commerce transaction with the first service provider, and participating in a chat session hosted by the first service provider. (i.e. the examiner assumes that applicant is limiting to a group of e-commerce or chat session. Both are taught by Shiloh as referenced above.)

32. **With respect to claim 71**, both Shiloh references teach the system of claim 69, wherein the programming instructions are further designed to enable the system to receive a list of personality profiles from the personality service provider, and identify for the personality service provider a selected one of the list of personality profiles. (i.e. rejected under a software system and browser that allows this process as in claims 45, 52, 58 64 and 69.)

33. **With respect to claim 72**, both Shiloh references teach the method of claim 45, wherein prior to transmission of the personality profile by the device, the personality profile is provided to the device by the second server. (i.e. as taught in Shiloh under the AVPP system, for example, Figure 2, and referred to above.)

34. **With respect to claim 73**, both Shiloh references teach an apparatus, comprising: means for receiving from a first server of a first service provider, a request for registration information for a user of the apparatus, the registration information requested including one or more personality characteristics; means for causing a second server of a second service provider to determine content of a web site provided by the first service provider, to categorize the web site based on the content, and to dynamically generate and provide a personality profile having one or more personality characteristics to portray a desired persona, the one or more personality characteristics being based at least in part on the categorization of the web site, the second service provider providing a personality service; and means for transmitting or causing the second server to transmit, the personality profile to the first server to respond to the request. (In light of examiner's 112 rejections this claim is interpreted to include similar features as to claims 45, 52, 58, 64 and 69 and is similarly rejected.)

35. **With respect to claim 74**, both Shiloh references teach a method, comprising: accessing or attempting to access by a computing device a web site of a first service provider by a user; receiving by a user, in response to the accessing or attempting to access a request for registration information, the registration information requested including one or more personality characteristics; causing, by a user, a second service provider to dynamically generate and provide a personality profile having one or more personality characteristics to portray a desired persona, the one or more personality characteristics being based at least in part on a determined categorization of the web site, the second service provider providing a personality service; and transmitting by a

user, or causing a server to transmit, the personality profile to the first service provider to respond to the request. (i.e. this claim is similarly rejected as to claims 45, 52, 58, 64, 69 and 73.) **It should be noted that Applicant's claim amendments filed 8-18-2009 are not properly marked for changes with respect to claim 64.** In order to advance prosecution, Examiner has provided a rejection. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Response to Arguments***

36. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 45-64 and 66-74 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

37. The Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of record, within the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply. Applicant, in preparing the response, should consider fully the entire reference as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael M. Thompson whose telephone number is (571) 270-3605. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8am-5:30 except Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Naresh Vig/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3629

/Michael M Thompson/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3629